

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 2-19 and 21-37. Independent claims 1 and 20 have been canceled and rewritten as new claims 38 and 39. Accordingly, claims 2-19 and 21-39 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections

The drawing was objected to because a brief descriptive label for each box and line was not provided. The Applicants have amended the drawing as noted on page 2 of this response. The Examiner's approval of the replacement drawing is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Objections - Informalities

The Examiner objected to claims 2-5, 10-11, 13-16, 21-24, 29-30 and 32-34 due to informalities. The Applicants have amended the claims to correct the informalities. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

4.) Claim Rejections - 37 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants have amended the claim to more particularly claim the invention. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-8, 16-20, 22, 25-28 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sun (US 5,247,623). The Applicants have amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from Sun. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been canceled and rewritten as new claim 38. Claim 38 recites a flexible method of enabling error-free delivery of data between a transmitting peer entity and a receiving peer entity when operating with changing service configurations corresponding to the delivery of data between the transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity. The method includes the steps of informing the transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity of a specific service configuration corresponding to the delivery of data between the transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity; and determining by the transmitting peer entity, a first set of rules corresponding to the specific service configuration. The first set of rules governs how and/or when the transmitting peer entity should send polling requests to the receiving peer entity. The method also includes sending a polling request from the transmitting peer entity to the receiving peer entity in accordance with the first set of rules; and determining by the receiving peer entity, a second set of rules corresponding to the specific service configuration. The second set of rules governs how and/or when the receiving peer entity should send status reports to the transmitting entity, in response to receiving one or more polling requests. The method additionally includes sending a status report from the receiving peer entity to the transmitting peer entity in accordance with the second set of rules.

Sun discloses the sending of polling requests between a plurality of PCs and a plurality of printers in order to connect a PC to an available printer. Receiver interface circuits at the printers send status reports to transmitter interface circuits at the PCs. (Col. 6, lines 17-21; col. 7, lines 8-21). However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Sun of a flexible method of sending polling requests and status reports that changes in accordance with different sets of rules that govern how and/or when to send the requests and reports. In the claimed invention, the sets of rules are selected depending on the specific service configuration that is set up for the delivery of data between the

transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity. Sun is designed for a single service configuration, and does not disclose or suggest any way to adapt the protocol to differing service configurations.

Basis for new claim 38 is found in the original specification on page 8, lines 1-17; and page 11, line 6 through page 12, line 4). Therefore, the allowance of claim 38 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-8 and 16-19 have been amended to depend from claim 38. Claims 2-8 and 16-19 recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 38. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2-8 and 16-19 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 20 has been canceled and rewritten as new claim 39. Claim 39 recites a flexible system for enabling error-free delivery of data between a transmitting peer entity and a receiving peer entity when operating with changing service configurations corresponding to the delivery of data between the transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity. The system includes means for informing the transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity of a specific service configuration corresponding to the delivery of data between the transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity; and a first set of rules corresponding to the specific service configuration. The first set of rules governs how and/or when the transmitting peer entity should send polling requests to the receiving peer entity. The system also includes means within the transmitting peer entity for selecting the first set of rules based upon the specific service configuration; and signaling means in the transmitting entity for sending a polling request from the transmitting peer entity to the receiving peer entity in accordance with the first set of rules. A second set of rules corresponding to the specific service configuration governs how and/or when the receiving peer entity should send status reports to the transmitting entity, in response to receiving one or more polling requests. The system additionally includes means within the receiving peer entity for selecting the second set of rules based upon the specific service configuration; and signaling means in the receiving peer entity for sending a status report from the receiving peer entity to the transmitting peer entity in accordance with the second set of rules.

Thus, claim 39 is a system claim corresponding to method claim 38, and is allowable over Sun for the reasons discussed above for claim 38.

Claims 22, 25-28 and 35-37 have been amended to depend from claim 39. Claims 22, 25-28 and 35-37 recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 39. Therefore, the allowance of claims 22, 25-28 and 35-37 is respectfully requested.

6.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 8-14, 21, 23-24 and 27-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun in view of Safadi (US 5,847,751). The Applicants have amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from Sun and Safadi. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has noted that several of the specific methods of sending polling requests and status reports that are recited in the Applicants' dependent claims are not disclosed by Sun, but are disclosed by Safadi. Nevertheless, like Sun, Safadi also fails to disclose or suggest a flexible method of sending polling requests and status reports that changes in accordance with different sets of rules that govern how and/or when to send the requests and reports. In the claimed invention, the sets of rules are selected depending on the specific service configuration that is set up for the delivery of data between the transmitting peer entity and the receiving peer entity. These features are not suggested by the combination of Sun and Safadi. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2, 4, 5, 8-14, 21, 23-24, and 27-34 is respectfully requested.

7.) Prior Art Not Relied Upon


In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure. However, none of the cited references appear to disclose or suggest a flexible method of sending polling requests and status reports, as claimed by the Applicants.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 2-19 and 21-39.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Date: 10-8-2003

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVW 2-C-2
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com